



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

<b>Applicant</b>	Zone 7 Water Agency	<b>County</b>	Alameda
<b>Project Title</b>	PCE Contamination Assessment, Central Bernal Subbasin	<b>Grant Request</b>	\$ 242,288.00
		<b>Total Project Cost</b>	\$ 242,288.00

**Project Description:** The Proposal investigates the presence of PCE contamination in the Livermore Valley Groundwater Basin, where future wellfield expansion is planned. The Project includes conducting a well profiling survey with depth-dependent water sampling in the impacted supply well to determine which depth intervals are contributing contamination to the well.

### Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	4
Work Plan	8
Budget	3
Schedule	4
QA/QC	5
Past Performance	5
Geographical Balance	0
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>34</b>

- **GWMP or Program:** The applicant's GWMP was formally adopted in September 21, 2005 and was submitted to DWR September 23, 2005.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is addressed but is not thoroughly documented. The proposed project presented will investigate and assess the presence of PCE contamination in the Central Bernal Subbasin within the Livermore Valley Groundwater Basin. Zone 7 presented a detailed description of the proposed project, presenting 3 goals of the proposal, and providing maps that identified locations of the needed facilities and the affected area. The applicant demonstrated collaboration with the well owner, RWQCB, and Fairgrounds (location of wells) Staff by scheduling face-to-face meetings over a period of the project tasks and opportunities for them to provide input. A definite and achievable knowledge will be gained and will improve groundwater management in the area. Results from this proposed project will help in planning potential well field expansion areas. However, one criteria Zone 7 was missing from the project description was an explanation of how the ongoing use of the wells installed would be monitored or maintained and future funding for those wells. Would this be the well owner's responsibility to maintain and monitor the installed wells, or Zone 7's responsibility to maintain and use for future monitoring, or would they be sealed after the completion of the project?
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is addressed but is not thoroughly documented. For example, the 2 of 3 goals presented in the work plan are different than the ones presented in the project description, essentially leading the reviewer to believe there are actually 5 goals for the proposed project. The applicant should present the same goals for the proposed project the whole way through the application. Subtask 1.1 – Research Potential Source Locations: the applicant states that their search will target potential PCE using businesses such as: dry cleaners, auto repairs shops, metal plating shops, semi-conductors manufactures, and chemical producers; however, in Subtask 1.2 and throughout the proposal the applicant focuses on dry cleaning sites and none of the other abovementioned businesses. Subtask 1.4 – Permitting: states the impacted well is located at the Fairgrounds and appropriate encroachment permits and permissions will be obtained. There were no assurances provided that Zone 7 would be able to get the appropriate permissions from Fairgrounds owners to access their property. For criteria concerning evaluating progress and performance at each step of the project the applicant presents Subtask 4.3 – Schedule and Budget Management which states that the budget and schedule will be reviewed weekly and if they are not on track corrective actions will be taken; however, no actual explanation of corrective actions was provided.



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## *IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013*

---

- **Budget:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. For example, the entire detailed budget provided gave incorrect numbers. All of the totals provided were off by anywhere from a few dollars to a few hundred dollars to a few thousand. Zone 7 provided hourly rates for their staff but did not provide a cost basis to back it up. The applicant stated in the explanatory text that their project management expenses were 4.7% of the requested grant funding which included project management, time to prepare quarterly reports, and budget and schedule management. The 4.7% actually did not take into account the quarterly reports, only project management and budget and schedule management. Had the applicant taken into account, as stated in the explanatory text, the total for project management would have been 13.4%. Lastly, in the explanatory text it is stated that there will be four progress reports prepared; however, in the work plan under Subtask 4.5 it is noted that three progress reports would be prepared. Four quotes were provided; however, some were missing explanation of hours needed to perform tasks and explanation of lump sums.
- **Schedule:** The criterion is fully addressed but is not thoroughly documented. Explanatory text was provided on how to read the schedule; however, there were a few discrepancies between the text and what was actually shown in the schedule. For example, Task 2.1 and 2.2 in the work plan state it will take 4 days to install the samplers and 2 days to retrieve and fill holes; yet, Zone 7 is scheduling 3 weeks per task and the description for the schedule for Task 2.2 shows 2 weeks. Task 2.3 – Groundwater Sampling is missing from the schedule; however through consensus and a closer look at the work plan descriptions, it is assumed that the applicant is including groundwater sampling in Task 2.2; hence the reason for the extra week added to task 2.2. Applicant should have included this information in the explanatory text and should have labeled Task 2.2 as CPT with MIP/ Groundwater Sampling. Again this is an assumption of the reviewers. Lastly, under Task 4 the applicant is missing milestones for the quarterly progress reports they said they would prepare.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. For example, procedural assurances were provided for reports, data, and lab analyses. Although a QA/QC Plan was not submitted for the Zone 7 Laboratory; however, the information includes CDPH accreditation for the Zone 7 water quality lab and many of the QA/QC procedures were written into the description under the sampling and surveys that would be covered in the proposed project. Personnel qualifications were provided for three Zone 7 employees. Standardized methodologies were provided, such as, ASTM and EPA procedures.
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. Zone 7 entered into a 2008-2009 LGA grant agreement with DWR in 2010. A performance evaluation from DWR was provided and stated that Zone 7 fulfilled all of the requirements under the LGA Program within budget and the allocated timeframe. The project was actually completed earlier than anticipated and 7% under budget. Also, Zone 7 also serves as lead agency for IRWM Plans Grant to develop the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water Management Plan.